

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

FEB 01 2007

REMARKS

In paragraphs 3 and 4 of the Office Action, claims 26-49 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph and second paragraph. Reconsideration is requested in view of this Amendment.

Claims 26 to 49 have been cancelled and new claims 50 to 64 have been submitted to avoid the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112 first and second paragraphs.

New claim 50 points out a washing product using the term set forth at page 4, line 26 of the specification. That formulation comprised the active principle and the deodorizing cleansing and aiding agent which has been specifically designed to be added, at a rate of 0.1 to 10%, by weight, to a cloth article base for washing cloth articles made of a fiber material, said agent including active principles at least part of which, after said cloth articles have been washed and rinsed, remain bound to the fiber material of the cloth articles for preventing human body enzymes from generating bad human body odors. New claim 50 further recites the feature that the active principles.

New claim 50 substantially corresponds to canceled claim 26, except that the erroneous expression "wherein said washing base is present in a by weight rate from 1.0 to 10%" has been corrected. Page 7 of the Applicant's disclosure, first paragraph, and in original claim 16 disclosed the range of 0.1 to 10% for the washing base. New claim 51, on the other hand, further points out that the active principle comprises one or more auxiliary

active principles. The fact that this active principles are "auxiliary" does not introduce new matter, since it is disclosed, for example, on page 1 of Applicant's disclosure.

New claims 52 to 58, on the other hand, specify the formulas of the glycol or lactic or citric or malic or tartaric or gluconic or mandelic acid esters.

In this connection, Applicant desires to draw the attention of the Examiner on the fact that canceled claims 39 and 40 have been erroneously drafted as two claims: actually, previous claims 39 and 40 were not two different claims but a single claim, i.e. a single claim 39 specifying the mandelic acid ester formula which has now been properly written. Claim 65 points out a washing product that consists essentially of the recited components.

Moreover, in drafting all the new claims, care has been put to overcome the specific rejections that were advanced by the Examiner in the final rejection.

The new claims recite that the percentages are percentages by weight. Moreover, all of the references to trademarks have been deleted. Furthermore, the terms mea and tea have been deleted and replaced with the corresponding compounds monoethylamine (mea) and triethylamine (tea) which are typically identified by the acronymns mea and tea. With respect to the term "quaternized tert amine", this term has been replaced with the term words quaternized tertiary amine. The prefix "tert" is a widely used abbreviation for tertiary. Thus, a tert-amine, as is known to one skilled in the art, corresponds to a "tertiary amine". The new claims have been drafted to use conventional chemical

terminology and to correct all errors that were identified in the canceled claims

Claims 26-49 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Vermeer.

Reconsideration is requested.

Veremeer does not disclose or suggest providing an active principle, as that term is used in claim 51, in combination with a cloth washing base in the amount pointed out in new claim 51 for the purpose of providing a washing formula product. All of the Veremeer formulations include a glycacarbamate or glycaurea compound. Veremeer neither teaches nor suggests the use of a cloth washing composition in which, after washing and rinsing, the cloth articles retain on their fibers the disclosed agent to prevent perspiration from generating bad odors.

Thus, Applicant does not agree with the assertion of the Examiner that "It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to make such a composition, because this reference teaches that all of the ingredients recited by Applicants are suitable for inclusion in a surfactant composition". As stated, the prior art document, neither teaches nor suggests that such a composition would be adapted for use in washing cloth articles, but only to wash body parts.

For these reasons, it is requested that this ground of rejection not be applied against the newly presented claims.

13

An early and favorable action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,


James V. Costigan
Reg. No. 25,669

Hedman & Costigan, P.C.
1185 Avenue of the Americas
New York NY 10036
(212) 302-8989